# VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE CURRICULUM CHANGES IN SCHOOLS IN URBAN-INFLUENCED AREAS

By

JAMES EDMOND YEISLEY

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1954

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
May, 1975

# VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE CURRICULUM CHANGES IN SCHOOLS IN URBAN-INFLUENCED AREAS

Thesis Approved:

Jack Feltner
Thesis Adviser

Robert Terry

Robert R Price

N N Durham
Dean of the Graduate College

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer would like to express his deep appreciation to Dr. Jack Pritchard, Agriculture Education Department, major adviser, for his guidance and supervision throughout the writing of this thesis.

Appreciation also is given to Dr. James Key and Dr. Robert Terry for their encouragement and guidance during my graduate program.

Acknowledgment is given to the 31 vocational agriculture instructors who completed questionnaires which were essential to the completion of this study.

Deep appreciation and recognition is given to my wife Gerry for her encouragement and assistance in completing this survey.

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| Chapter | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| I. | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| | Statement of the Problem | 2 |
| | Purpose of the Study | 2 |
| | Method of Procedure | 3 |
| | Definition of Terms | 4 |
| II. | REVIEW OF LITERATURE | 5 |
| III. | PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA | 20 |
| | Descriptive Data about Vocational Agriculture Teachers | 20 |
| | Influence of Non-Farm Students on Vocational Agriculture Curriculum | 22 |
| | Supervised Training Projects | 26 |
| | Descriptive Data of Students and Parents | 27 |
| | Vocational Agriculture Units of Instruction | 30 |
| | Vocational Agriculture Facilities | 33 |
| | Participation in Vocational Agriculture Activities | 36 |
| | Participation in Contests | 41 |
| | Curriculum Changes | 43 |
| IV. | SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 45 |
| | Summary of Findings | 45 |
| | Conclusions | 46 |
| | Recommendations | 47 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | | 49 |
| APPENDIX A | | 52 |
| APPENDIX B | | 56 |

## LIST OF TABLES


| Table | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| I. | Descriptive Data about Vocational Agriculture Teachers Included in the Study . . . . . | 21 |
| II. | Analysis of Influence of Non-Farm Students on Vocational Agriculture Curriculum by Time Period . . . . . | 23 |
| III. | Amount of Influence of Non-Farm Students upon Vocational Agriculture Curriculum . . . . . | 24 |
| IV. | Supervised Training Projects . . . . . | 26 |
| V. | Descriptive Data of Students and Parents . . . | 28 |
| VI. | Descriptive Data of Students . . . . . | 30 |
| VII. | Comparison of Vocational Agriculture Units of Instruction . . . . . | 31 |
| VIII. | Analysis of Influence of Non-Farm Students on Vocational Agriculture Curriculum Units Taught . . . . . | 33 |
| IX. | Comparison of Vocational Agriculture Facilities . . . . . | 34 |
| X. | Analysis of Influence of Non-Farm Students on Change in Vocational Agriculture Facilities | 35 |
| XI. | Comparison of Vocational Agriculture Activities . . . . . | 37 |
| XII. | Level of Participation in Contests . . . . . | 39 |
| XIII. | Analysis of Influence of Non-Farm Students on Participation in Contests . . . . . | 40 |
| XIV. | Beginning of Participation in Contests . . . . | 41 |

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

Over the past several decades there has been an increasing number of persons moving away from the farm. Because of the decreasing number of farms and farmers, we hear the statement that there is no longer a place in the school curriculum for vocational agriculture.

However, within the past decade, there also has been a reversal of the trend of moving from "the country." Because of improved transportation methods and improvement of public utilities in rural areas, people are finding that they can enjoy all the benefits of "country living" and still maintain employment in the city. Couples are discovering that "the country" or the suburbs are good places to rear a family.

For these reasons, there has been an increasing number of non-farm students enrolled in vocational agriculture. This study was conducted by the writer to determine how the curriculum in vocational agriculture has changed and is changing to accommodate the needs of all students--both farm and non-farm.

## Statement of the Problem

Because the increase of non-farm students has caused the objectives of vocational agriculture to change to meet the changing needs in urban-influenced areas, a study of the changes in curriculum was deemed timely. This problem was identified through the personal experience of the writer in teaching in an urban-associated area of Oklahoma. In addition, the very limited amount of curriculum change information has indicated the need for further research in the area. It was further felt that such a study might be of value in assisting vocational agriculture teachers and counselors in their attempts to adjust their curriculum and service to meet the needs of their students.

Hopefully, this information will be used as a reference by people working with vocational agriculture students in urban-influenced areas.

## Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to compare the changes in curriculum taught to vocational agriculture students living in urban-influenced areas. Because enrollment of non-farm students has increased, the study was designed to determine what has been done and is being done to update vocational agriculture curriculum in urban-influenced areas.

A secondary purpose was to secure information which may be used by high schools in counseling and establishing optimum curriculum requirements for urban-influenced areas.

The following specific objectives for the study were formulated:

1. To determine and compare the changes in curriculum material prior to and after 1970.

2. To determine and compare the changes in facilities prior to and after 1970.

3. To determine and compare the changes in activities prior to and after 1970.

## Method of Procedure

This study was limited to thirty-four schools located in urban-influenced areas over the state that offered vocational agriculture. Since these schools were located in urban-influenced areas, it was felt that they would constitute a representative situation for the study. The schools selected for this study were selected on the basis of location to urban areas.

A questionnaire, formulated by the writer, was used to collect information used in this study. The questionnaire was designed to identify the change in curriculum taught vocational agriculture students since 1970.

## Definition of Terms

Farm student. A student who lives on 20 acres or more.

Non-farm student. A student who lives on less than 20 acres, but could through the help of his parents secure land and facilities to conduct a farming operation.

Fringe area. A plot of land containing up to 5 acres.

Acreage. A plot of land containing 5 acres, but less than 20 acres.

Farm. A plot of land containing 20 or more acres.

Curriculum material. Material used in instruction both in the classroom and outside the classroom.

Activities. Activities usually associated with FFA in addition to classroom activities, such as contests and educational trips.

Facilities. Structures or properties such as buildings, shops, greenhouses, and school farms.

Urban-influenced area. Cities of 20,000 population or more and areas within 15 miles of city limits of such cities.

Agribusiness. Agricultural business conducted elsewhere other than a farm.

# CHAPTER II

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Teachers of vocational agriculture across the nation have been faced with the fact that vocational agriculture curriculum must either change to meet the needs of an expanding community or it will lose its place in the school curriculum.

The day of the little red school house is gone forever. Reading, 'riting, and 'rithmetic are no longer enough; neither is production agriculture in the traditional sense. Meder (9) stated, "I know that agriculture means more than farming and that it has a place in city schools" (p. 269).

Very few communities are completely rural any longer, and even rural communities are influenced in most cases by a fairly large city within an hour's driving time.

It is to the credit of teachers of vocational agriculture that they have seen, and indeed have been a part of, the urbanization of the "country." They have proposed plans to update the traditional agriculture curriculum, designed new curriculum courses, and have put their ideas to work. They have not changed for change's sake, but because change

has been good. As Glancy (7) stated, "The program must meet the interests and needs of the students and the community" (p. 46). Downs (4) summed this up beautifully when he stated that "The product of vocational education is a well trained individual who is placed in the field for which he is prepared" (p. 144). Childers (3) foresaw in a 1969 survey a vocational agriculture program directed at preparing students for specialized jobs in the agricultural complex. Parents in the same survey felt that "career selection" ranked most important in vocational agriculture curriculum.

The statement that "agriculture is on its way out" is baseless. Future generations cannot and will not exist without food, shelter, and clothing. Sellers (14) stated that the fact that forty percent of the labor force in this country is either in production farming or some equally important agriculturally related job must be and has been the incentive to adjust instructional programs to meet the needs of all--farm, suburban, urban.

Glancy (7), Director of Vocational Agriculture of Delaware Metropolitan School District, Muncie, Indiana, stated that there were as many ways to improve and conduct a vocational agriculture program as there were teachers of vocational agriculture.

He further stated that teachers of vocational agriculture do a selling job of the program. Pre-school books

at home and in the elementary schools are basically agriculture centered. He even suggested that agriculture teachers help write or advise writers of elementary books to present the image of agriculture as an industry with many, many varied occupations and not just Farmer Brown on his farm. Capitalize on the interest of the young elementary student and continue guidance into high school was suggested by several educators.

Glancy (7) and others have worked closely with the counselors in their schools in developing programs that fit and met the needs of the students. The vocational agriculture program was built around the student and his needs instead of fitting the student into the program. The guidance personnel must be as completely informed and knowledgeable about agriculture as the teachers.

The Delaware Metropolitan School District was a rural-urban community with three small towns within its boundaries and a city of 75,000 bordering one of its boundaries. Operating upon the theory that a person does not have to be from a farm to have an interest in agriculture or its related areas, the agriculture curriculum changed from Agriculture I, II, III, and IV plus shop to a greatly expanded curriculum. Working closely with the vocational guidance personnel, the following curriculum operating on a semester basis was developed:

Introduction to Vocational Agriculture was offered as a freshman class only and was a two-semester course. It acted as an orientation course and acquainted students with the opportunities in agriculture. It also was a prerequisite to a major in vocational agriculture. Classes in Production Agriculture included one semester courses in Soil Science, Crop Science, Animal Science, Farm Management, and Agriculture Science. Classes in Ornamental Agriculture were Horticulture I and II, Landscaping I and II, and Conservation. Advanced Landscaping and Ornamental Horticulture Management Specialties were offered as summer courses. The On-the-Job Training Program offered Public Relations and Agriculture Occupations as a summer course or credit for one or two semesters. Classes in Agriculture Mechanics were Small Gasoline Engines I and II; Welding I and II; Electric, Plumbing, and Concrete; Farm Carpentry; Farm Structures; and Farm Mechanics (both summer courses).

Floral Arranging and Rural-Urban Development were classes that were to be added as space permitted.

Further proof that vocational agriculture has a place in the curriculum in any type community--rural, suburban, or urban--was seen in the program in Los Angeles, California, second largest city in the United States. Success in any vocational program is placement of students in jobs, and the

success story in the program there was tremendous. There, as in schools across the nation, emphasis had changed from production agriculture to provide vocational and avocational programs for junior and senior high students.

Regan (13), Supervisor of Agricultural Education for Los Angeles, revealed that agricultural education began on the elementary level. Nine Agriculture-Science centers were located throughout the school district. Demonstrations and lessons were conducted by a trained staff for elementary school children who were bussed to the centers. Four mobile units were also used--Dairy, Conservation, Small Livestock, and Wild Life.

Three course offerings were offered in grades seven through nine--Exploratory Horticulture, Horticulture, and Floriculture. Every seventh-grade boy was enrolled in a ten-week exploratory horticulture class. Students who developed an interest in the field were permitted to enroll in a two-year elective course in horticulture in grades eight and nine.

Girls were also included in the agricultural education program. Floriculture had been offered for over 13 years. Designed as a semester course, basic information on plant growth and horticultural practices were taught along with experiences in corsage construction and floral arrangement.

Facilities for instruction in agriculture and horticulture had been standardized. Every junior high and high school in the Los Angeles school district built since 1950 had had the following facilities constructed: classroom, laboratory room, lath-house, glasshouse with outside storage facilities, and one acre of growing grounds.

High school programs were more diversified and intensive. Plant and Soil Science was a one-year laboratory science course which met the University of California entrance requirements and was designed for academically-inclined students. Classroom instruction which involved demonstrations and experiments; implementation of scientific principles and how they relate to plant growth on experimental plots; and extensive use of glasshouse and lath-house were all a part of the course. A survey conducted at three of the high schools in 1966 revealed that 63 percent of the students who had completed the one-year course were continuing their education in four-year colleges in the agricultural sciences. Five additional high schools added this program.

Seventeen high schools offered vocational horticulture. The ornamental and landscape industry in Los Angeles and other parts of Southern California is a multi-million dollar industry. Surveys and estimates of an advisory committee

indicated a continuing growth of employment opportunities in the field. A survey of graduates in 1967 revealed that over 90 percent of the graduates were employed in the area for which they had had training or were continuing their education in agriculture--all within six months of graduation.

Floriculture was designed primarily for girls. A two-year course, instruction included propagation of plants, growing ornamental and floral type plants, floral arrangement, corsage construction, and use of floral materials in indoor and outdoor beautification. Many girls received enough instruction to obtain employment as floral designers in local flower shops.

An experimental vocational floriculture course was conducted with the primary purpose of training girls for entry-level positions in the floral industry.

General horticulture courses were offered also. New vocational courses added were Landscape Design and Construction, a two-semester course, providing further specialization in vocational horticulture, and Laboratory Animal Technician. The latter was designed for junior and senior students who were to be trained for entry-level positions as junior animal technicians. Facilities included a standard classroom and laboratory and an environmental-controlled laboratory room equipped with stainless steel multi-banked cages to house laboratory animals.

The Vocational Education Act of 1963 provided for work-experience activities. Students in the work-study program were employed in the area of landscape and nursery management with the school gardening staff and with personnel from the Parks and Recreation Department of the city.

A vital part of the vocational program was FFA. It benefited urban youth immeasurably in leadership training, opportunities to participate in fairs and shows, judging, speech and parliamentary procedure.

Two additional contests were conducted each year: a Horticulture Contest sponsored by the chapters of the Southern California Association of Nurseryman and a Los Angeles Beautiful Planting Contest sponsored by Sears Roebuck Foundation, Women's Architectural League, and Los Angeles Beautiful Incorporated.

Foster (6), Program Evaluator of Vocational Education, stated that only in 1967 was agriculture added to the basic vocational discipline in the San Diego City Schools, the second most populous urban complex in California. The curriculum had expanded from Horticulture (primarily) to Horticulture (Basic and Advanced), Ornamental Horticulture Mechanics, Floriculture and Related, Small Animal Care, Veterinary Aide, and Landscape Maintenance and Design, basically the same as that of the Los Angeles schools where agriculture

had been a part of the curriculum in some schools for over 30 years.

The agriculture curriculum designed by Staller (15) at Janesville, Wisconsin, had been changed to an agribusiness oriented one. A program was developed that would attract quality urban boys and girls with a genuine interest in agriculture and still administer to farm students who wanted farm training.

An Agriculture Survey, offered to ninth grade students at any of the three junior high schools, was devoted to the student's study of himself, jobs and careers, and relating one to the other. The guidance staff worked closely with the student to crystalize his career objectives.

Biological Agriculture was offered to tenth grade students who successfully completed the orientation course. It was a team-taught class taught by the biology teacher and the agriculture teacher. It laid the scientific basis for further agribusiness study. The audio-tutorial method of instruction was used and each student progressed at his own pace.

Five other courses were offered during the junior and senior years on an alternating basis: Conservation, Animal Science, Power Mechanics, Soils, and Horticulture.

In all classes, nine through twelve, students who were interested in farming carried on traditional farming programs. Students who were interested in agribusiness were placed on jobs when opportunities arose. Thur (16) pointed out that one of the trends in vocational agriculture appeared to be supervised work experience including work in agriculturally related occupations.

The FFA took over the operation of two local apple and pear orchards. It provided over 800 hours of occupational horticulture experience for students who were interested. Conservation experiences were provided through a 51-acre soil and water conservation farm rented by the FFA. Contour strip crops of hay and corn were planted. Prunings from the orchard were used to create wildlife brush piles and about 1,900 pheasant hens were raised by conservation students and released on this and neighboring farms.

Adjacent to the wildlife farm was an 80-acre tract of mixed hardwoods. Located on a glacial outwash and terminal moraine and ungrazed for 26 years, it provided students with unlimited conservation activity. It even had several streams. Conservation students also had an opportunity to utilize a summer training program conducted by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. In addition, the conservation farm also allowed opportunities for soil testing,

fertility and population trials, insect and disease control, and other related activities.

In a study conducted in 1970 by Bjoraker and Pumper (2), it was revealed that Wisconsin teachers more or less still taught traditional production agriculture. Agriculturally related occupations and career opportunities were secondary to production agriculture. Instructional areas accepted and advocated by professional educators had not really become a significant part of the local vo-ag curriculum.

The survey revealed, however, that there was a need for up-dating vocational agriculture curriculum. The authors felt that a revised curriculum should address itself to (1) production agriculture units that have the highest priority; (2) agriculturally related occupations; (3) career development; (4) youth development; (5) job entry and pre-job entry skills; and (6) college and other post high school preparation.

Of all the material reviewed, nearly every author who had designed a successful new curriculum stated that the curriculum must be designed to meet the needs of the students and that it also prepare the student for employment immediately after high school or prepare them for higher education. All new curriculum involved career guidance--either on the part of the vocational agriculture teacher himself or the professional guidance staff or both.

In most cases, curriculum was changed from the traditional Agriculture I, II, III, and IV curriculum to a more flexible, more relevant one to meet the needs, both present and future, of urban and suburban students. Many courses were offered on a semester basis, and thus the course offerings were doubled. In schools where there were more than one teacher, the number of course offerings multiplied several times. Twenty-seven nine-week courses were offered in Delaware Hayes High School. The curriculum included a two-year pre-Agribusiness program, a two-year Junior-Senior Agribusiness program, two years of Horticulture, plus a four-year program in Production Agriculture with specialties in Agri-mechanics, Animal Science, and Crop Science. The program was so successful that four new nine-week courses were added and a second and third teacher were added as noted by Archer (1).

Many educators suggested that teachers of agriculture capitalize on the interest of the young in agriculture. Nearly all the new curriculum designed offered a survey course in agriculture. Two educators suggested that these courses begin either on the seventh or eighth grade level. Noakes (11) suggested that this course be one in practical arts and that it develop an appreciation of agricultural processes and provide opportunities for students to make a

start in developing mechanical and scientific skills in agriculture. Faulkner (5) suggested that the course be an introduction to occupations in the world of work.

Practically all vocational agriculture departments that had developed and used new curriculum ideas provided for specialization during the junior and senior years and most provided for on-the-job training.

Horticulture was one course that had been added to so many of the curricula. Other classes included Forestry, Agriculture Mechanics, Masonry, Metal Working, Power Mechanics, and Building Construction.

One new course added to the agriculture curriculum at Brownstown, Illinois, by Mills (10) was Agricology. The agribusiness student was made aware of the responsibility that his business had in protecting the ecology. Students hosted the Southern Illinois Edwardsville Water Testing Van. They tested water samples and talked to the Chairman of the Sanitation Technology Program and viewed possible career choices in the areas of water pollution. In Agricology Mechanics, students reclaimed and recycled abandoned and unused farm machinery.

Students were made aware that any career that they entered would be governed by some law to protect the environment and that he must know the rules. Chemical produc-

tion in the United States was discussed so that students were made aware of their potential problem in the environment.

As stated earlier, there are as many ways of improving and updating the agriculture curriculum as there are teachers of agriculture. There are also nearly as many course titles as there are teachers.

The things that most systems had in common in updating and improving the agriculture curriculum were these:

1. The needs of the students and the community were the basis for the curriculum.

2. The guidance staff worked closely with the teacher of agriculture or the teacher himself did a great deal of counseling.

3. Career preparation was the major goal of the curriculum.

In short, teachers of vocational agriculture have become teachers in career education. Matteson (8) defined career education as an attempt to make curriculum more relevant to all students. This means not only for college-bound students but also for those students who become employed after high school graduation or enroll in a post secondary vocational or technical school.

Finally, as stated by Patton and Reeder (12), to help teachers of vocational agriculture in Oklahoma develop instructional programs that are designed for the individual student, the Oklahoma Curriculum and Instructional Materials came into operation in June, 1970. Students who plan to enter the broad field of agriculture have an opportunity to study the following areas: (1) Basic Core Curriculum I, II, III, and IV and (2) two units of farm mechanics and occupational training (for junior and senior students only). This curriculum gives training in animal science, plant and soil science, leadership, careers and orientation, chemicals, farm business management, farm mechanics, and supervised farm training--all of which can be found under a similar or the same name in the curriculum of schools previously mentioned.

# CHAPTER III

## PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter deals with the presentation and analysis of information obtained from 31 teachers of vocational agriculture in urban-influenced schools located within 15 miles of cities of 20,000.*

Out of 34 questionnaires sent, 31 were returned giving a 91.2 percent return.

### Descriptive Data about Vocational Agriculture Teachers

Table I deals with descriptive data from vocational agriculture teachers included in the study.

Eleven teachers, or 35.4 percent, included in the survey had been teaching vocational agriculture one to five years. Eight teachers, or 25.8 percent, had been teaching vocational agriculture six to ten years. Two teachers, or 6.5 percent, had been teaching eleven to fifteen years; and two teachers, or 6.5 percent, had been teaching sixteen to

*Schools included in the survey are listed in the appendix.

twenty years. Eight teachers, or 25.8 percent, included in the survey had been teaching twenty-one or more years.

TABLE I

DESCRIPTIVE DATA ABOUT VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE TEACHERS INCLUDED IN THE STUDY

| Teacher Variable | Distribution N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Years Teaching Vocational Agriculture | | |
| 1 - 5 | 11 | 35.4 |
| 6 - 10 | 8 | 25.8 |
| 11 - 15 | 2 | 6.5 |
| 16 - 20 | 2 | 6.5 |
| 21 or more | 8 | 25.8 |
| Total | 31 | 100.0 |
| Years in Present School | | |
| 1 - 5 | 17 | 54.8 |
| 6 - 10 | 6 | 19.4 |
| 11 - 15 | 2 | 6.5 |
| 16 - 20 | 1 | 3.2 |
| 21 or more | 5 | 16.1 |
| Total | 31 | 100.0 |

Seventeen of the teachers included in the survey, or 54.8 percent, had been teaching one to five years in their present schools. Six teachers, or 19.4 percent, had been

teaching in their present schools six to ten years. Two teachers, or 6.5 percent, had been teaching in their present schools eleven to fifteen years. One teacher, or 3.2 percent, had been teaching in his present school sixteen to twenty years. Five teachers, or 16.1 percent, had been teaching at their present schools twenty-one or more years.

In summary, Table I indicates that the majority of teachers (61.2) percent) included in the study have taught ten years or less. It was of interest to note that eight (25.8 percent) of the teachers had a tenure of twenty-one (21) years or more in the profession.

## Influence of Non-Farm Students on Vocational Agriculture Curriculum

Table II compares the influence of non-farm students on curriculum offered in vocational agriculture by time period.

The time periods used throughout this chapter are (1) Prior to 1970 and (2) Since 1970. The purpose of this separation was to disclose various changes brought about in programs with reference to time period. It should be pointed out that eleven teachers had taught five years or less; therefore, they could not and did not respond as to what was done prior to 1970.

TABLE II

ANALYSIS OF INFLUENCE OF NON-FARM STUDENTS ON VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE CURRICULUM BY TIME PERIOD

| Time Period | Distribution N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Prior to 1970 | 4 | 12.9 |
| Since 1970 | 12 | 38.7 |
| Both Prior to and Since 1970 | 15 | 48.4 |
| Total | 31 | 100.0 |

Four teachers, or 12.9 percent, stated that non-farm students had influenced vocational agriculture curriculum offered at their schools prior to 1970. By comparison, twelve teachers, or 38.7 percent, stated that non-farm students had influenced vocational agriculture curriculum offered at their schools since 1970. Fifteen teachers, or 48.4 percent, or nearly half the teachers surveyed, stated that non-farm students had influenced the curriculum offered in vocational agriculture both prior to and since 1970.

In summary, Table II indicates that nearly half of the teachers surveyed indicated that non-farm students had influenced vocational agriculture curriculum offered at their schools both prior to and since 1970.

Table III is related to Table II in that it deals with the amount of influence that non-farm students had upon vocational agriculture curriculum offered in schools surveyed.

The question on the survey was so worded that the respondent answered by choosing from one of five choices: very greatly, greatly, slightly, very slightly, and none.

TABLE III

AMOUNT OF INFLUENCE OF NON-FARM STUDENTS UPON VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE CURRICULUM

| Amount of Influence | Distribution N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Very Greatly | 0 | 0 |
| Greatly | 8 | 25.8 |
| Slightly | 17 | 54.8 |
| Very Slightly | 4 | 12.9 |
| None | 2 | 6.5 |
| Total | 31 | 100.0 |

Of the 31 schools that participated in the survey, none of the teachers reported that non-farm students influenced the vocational agriculture curriculum very greatly.

Eight teachers, or 25.8 percent, reported that non-farm students had greatly influenced vocational agriculture curriculum offered. Seventeen, or 54.8 percent, reported that non-farm students only slightly influenced curriculum offered in vocational agriculture. Four teachers, or 12.9 percent, reported that non-farm students influenced vocational agriculture curriculum very slightly. Two teachers, or 6.5 percent, stated that non-farm students did not influence vocational agriculture curriculum at their schools at all.

In summary, it was of interest to note that though nearly half the teachers (48.4) percent) surveyed indicated that non-farm students had influenced the vocational agriculture curriculum offered at their schools, seventeen (54.8 percent) indicated that non-farm students had influenced the curriculum only slightly. One fourth the teachers (25.8 percent) indicated that non-farm students had greatly influenced vocational agriculture curriculum as compared to only six and one-half percent (6.5) who indicated that non-farm students had not influenced vocational agriculture curriculum offered in their schools.

## Supervised Training Projects

Table IV reveals information about the students enrolled in vocational agriculture in the 31 schools that participated in the survey. Seventy-four and four-tenths percent (74.4) of the students, or 1,692, had supervised training projects. Twenty-five and six-tenths percent (25.6), or 582, did not have supervised training projects.

TABLE IV

SUPERVISED TRAINING PROJECTS

| Student Status | Distribution N | Distribution % |
|---|---|---|
| Students having a Supervised Training Project | 1,692 | 74.4 |
| Students not having a Supervised Training Project | 582 | 25.6 |
| Total | 2,274 | 100.0 |

In summary, Table IV indicates that nearly three-fourths (74.4 percent) of the students enrolled in vocational agriculture in the 31 schools included in the survey had super-

vised training projects as compared to one-fourth (25.6) percent who did not.

## Descriptive Data of Students and Parents

Table V contains descriptive data about students and their parents from schools in urban-influenced areas. Urban-influenced areas were defined as being within 15 miles of a city of 20,000.

Fifty-one percent (51) of the students enrolled in vocational agriculture, or 1,162, lived within city limits. Twenty-nine percent (29), or 666, lived in fringe areas. Fringe area was defined as a plot of land containing up to five acres. Eighteen and six-tenths percent (18.6), or 424 of the students, lived on acreages. Acreage was defined as a plot of land containing five acres, but less than 20 acres. Twenty-one and eight-tenths percent (21.8), or 496 students, lived on a farm, defined as a plot of land containing 20 or more acres.

Percentages were based on a total of 2,274 students enrolled in vocational agriculture.

The second part of Table V contains information about parent's occupations of those students enrolled in vocational agriculture.

TABLE V

DESCRIPTIVE DATA OF STUDENTS AND PARENTS

| Comparison Factor | Distribution N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Place of Residence | | |
| Within City Limits | 1,162 | 51.0 |
| Fringe Area | 666 | 29.2 |
| On Acreages | 424 | 18.6 |
| Farm | 496 | 21.8 |
| Parent's Occupations | | |
| Related to Agriculture | 724 | 31.8 |
| Part-Time Farming and Off-Farm Employment | 674 | 29.6 |
| Full-Time Farming | 190 | 8.3 |
| Unrelated to Agriculture | 1,129 | 49.0 |

Note: Table V contains no totals. Certain areas--such as Within City Limits and Fringe Area and Related to Agriculture and Part-Time Farming and Off-Farm Employment--overlap.

Thirty-one and eight-tenths percent (31.8) of the students, or 724, had parents whose occupations were related to agriculture. Twenty-nine and six-tenths percent (29.6) of the students, or 674, had parents who were engaged in part-time farming and off-farm employment. Eight and three-tenths percent (8.3) of the students, or 190, had parents engaged in full-time farming. Forty-nine percent (49) and nearly

half of the students, or 1,129, had parents who were engaged in occupations unrelated to agriculture.

In summary, Table V indicates that fifty-one percent (51) of the students who were enrolled in vocational agriculture in the survey schools lived within the city limits and twenty-nine and two-tenths (29.2) lived in fringe areas. The second part of the table reveals that nearly half the parents of those students have occupations unrelated to agriculture.

Table VI indicates that fifty-nine and four-tenths percent (59.4), or 935, of the students enrolled in vocational agriculture in 1970 in the 31 schools surveyed were non-farm students as compared to sixty-two percent (62), or 1,410 students enrolled in vocational agriculture in 1974. Forty and six-tenths percent (40.6), or 639, of the students enrolled in vocational agriculture in 1970 in the 31 schools surveyed were farm students; thirty-eight percent (38), or 864, of the students enrolled in these same schools were farm students in 1974.

In summary, Table VI reveals that both in 1970 and 1974 the percentage of non-farm students enrolled in vocational agriculture in the 31 urban-influenced schools included in the survey was greater than the number of farm students.

TABLE VI

DESCRIPTIVE DATA OF STUDENTS

| Time Period | Distribution | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Non-Farm | | Farm | | Total | Total Percent |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| 1970 | 935 | 59.4 | 639 | 40.6 | 1,574 | 100.0 |
| 1974 | 1,410 | 62.0 | 864 | 38.0 | 2,274 | 100.0 |

Note: Six schools did not report 1970 figures because they were staffed by new teachers.

## Vocational Agriculture Units of Instruction

Table VII compares units of vocational agriculture taught by time period. Prior to 1970, Electricity was the one unit of instruction that had been added most to the vocational agriculture curriculum in the schools surveyed. Eleven schools, 35.5 percent, had added this unit. Conservation, Agribusiness, and Plumbing had been added as units in nine schools, or 29 percent. Career Education, Farm Carpentry, and Concrete had been added in seven schools, or 22.6 percent. Small Engines and Masonry had been added in six schools, or 19.4 percent.

TABLE VII

COMPARISON OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE
UNITS OF INSTRUCTION

| Units | Distribution | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Prior to 1970 | | Since 1970 | |
| | N | % | N | % |
| Horticulture | 4 | 12.9 | 7 | 22.6 |
| Greenhouse Management | 1 | 3.2 | 4 | 12.9 |
| Nursery Production | 1 | 3.2 | 3 | 9.7 |
| Turf Maintenance | 3 | 9.7 | 3 | 9.7 |
| Conservation | 9 | 29.0 | 8 | 25.8 |
| Agribusiness | 9 | 29.0 | 14 | 45.1 |
| Career Education | 7 | 22.6 | 16 | 51.6 |
| Small Animal Care | 3 | 9.7 | 4 | 12.9 |
| Landscape | 3 | 9.7 | 7 | 22.6 |
| Vegetable Production | 3 | 9.7 | 8 | 25.8 |
| Wildlife | 2 | 6.5 | 4 | 12.9 |
| Agriculture Chemicals and Use | 9 | 29.0 | 7 | 22.6 |
| Ecology | 2 | 6.5 | 6 | 19.4 |
| Small Engines | 6 | 19.4 | 1 | 3.2 |
| Electricity | 11 | 35.5 | 2 | 6.5 |
| Masonry | 6 | 19.4 | 1 | 3.2 |
| Plumbing | 9 | 29.0 | 3 | 9.7 |
| Farm Carpentry | 7 | 22.6 | 4 | 12.9 |
| Concrete | 7 | 22.6 | 4 | 12.9 |
| Farm Structures | 4 | 12.9 | 6 | 19.4 |
| Others (Listed by Respondents) | | | | |
| Poultry | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.2 |
| Horses | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.2 |
| Tractor Safety | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.2 |
| Artificial Insemination | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.2 |
| VAOT | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.2 |
| No Response | 1 | 3.2 | 1 | 3.2 |

In comparison, in vocational agriculture units of instruction added since 1970, Career Education had been added

in sixteen schools, or 51.6 percent, followed by Agribusiness, which had been added in fourteen schools, or 45.1 percent. Conservation, Vegetable Production, and Small Engines had been added to the curriculum in eight schools, or 25.8 percent. Horticulture, Landscape, and Agriculture Chemicals and Use had been added in seven schools, or 22.6 percent. Ecology and Farm Structures had been added to six school's curriculum, or 19.4 percent.

In summary, it was of interest to note that Career Education and Agribusiness were by far the two units of vocational agriculture curriculum that had been added more than any other unit since 1970.

Table VIII reveals that twenty of the 31 schools participating in the survey, or 64.5 percent, indicated that the number of non-farm students influenced the vocational agriculture units added both prior to and since 1970. Eleven schools, or 35.5 percent, reported that the number of non-farm students did not influence the vocational agriculture units.

In summary, Table VIII reports that nearly two-thirds (64.5 percent) of the schools surveyed indicated that the number of non-farm students had influenced the number of vocational agriculture units added prior to and since 1970. Approximately one-third (35.5 percent) indicated that the

number of non-farm students did not influence vocational agriculture units added.

TABLE VIII

ANALYSIS OF INFLUENCE OF NON-FARM STUDENTS ON VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE CURRICULUM UNITS TAUGHT

| Non-Farm Student Influence | Distribution N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 20 | 64.5 |
| No | 11 | 35.5 |
| Total | 31 | 100.0 |

## Vocational Agriculture Facilities

Data presented in Table IX reveal that of vocational agriculture facilities added prior to 1970, Shop was the one facility that was available to vocational agriculture programs more than any other. Shop had been added to fourteen schools, or 45.2 percent. A School Farm had been added to five schools (16.1 percent) and Greenhouses to three schools (9.7 percent).

Of facilities that had been added since 1970, seven schools, 22.6 percent, reported that a School Farm had been added. Shop had been added to vocational agriculture departments in four schools (12.9 percent). A Laboratory and Classrooms had been added facilities in three schools, or 9.7 percent.

TABLE IX

COMPARISON OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE FACILITIES

| | Availability by Time Period | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Prior to 1970 | | Since 1970 | |
| Type Facility | N | % | N | % |
| Shop | 14 | 45.2 | 4 | 12.9 |
| Greenhouse | 3 | 9.7 | 1 | 3.2 |
| Nursery | 1 | 3.2 | 0 | 0 |
| Laboratory | 2 | 6.5 | 3 | 9.7 |
| School Farm | 5 | 16.1 | 7 | 22.6 |
| Others (Listed by Respondents) | | | | |
| Vo-Ag Building | 1 | 3.2 | 1 | 3.2 |
| Classroom | 2 | 6.5 | 3 | 9.7 |
| Project Pens | 1 | 3.2 | 0 | 0 |
| VAOT | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.2 |
| Tractor School | 1 | 3.2 | 0 | 0 |
| No Response | 1 | 3.2 | 11 | 35.5 |
| Total | 31 | 100.0 | 31 | 100.0 |

In summary, Shop was the one facility that had been added most to vocational agriculture facilities prior to 1970 in contrast to a School Farm which had been added most to facilities of the 31 schools surveyed. Also of interest was the fact that eleven schools, or 35.5 percent, submitted no response.

Table X data reveal that of the schools surveyed, twenty, or 64.5 percent, of the schools reported that non-farm students had influenced change that had been made in facilities. Nine schools, or 29 percent, stated that the number of non-farm students did not influence change in facilities. Two schools, or 6.5 percent, did not respond to the question on the survey.

TABLE X

ANALYSIS OF INFLUENCE OF NON-FARM STUDENTS ON CHANGE IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE FACILITIES

| Influence of Non-Farm Students | Distribution N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 20 | 64.5 |
| No | 9 | 29.0 |
| No Response | 2 | 6.5 |
| Total | 31 | 100.0 |

In summary, Table X indicates that nearly two-thirds of the survey schools, or 64.5 percent, reported that non-farm students had influenced the facilities that had been added to the vocational agriculture program.

## Participation in Vocational Agriculture Activities

Table XI compares the participation of the 31 survey schools in vocational agriculture activities prior to and since 1970. Twelve schools, or 38.7 percent, reported that they had participated in Land Contests prior to 1970. Ten schools, or 32.3 percent, reported that they participated in Public Speaking Contests prior to 1970. Nine schools, 29 percent, reported that they participated in Farm Shop (Agriculture Mechanics) Contests. Eight schools, 25.8 percent, reported that they participated in Livestock Contests prior to 1970. Seven schools, 22.6 percent, reported that they participated in Dairy Cattle, Meats, and Parliamentary Procedure Contests. Six schools, or 19.4 percent, stated that they participated in Crops and Range and Pasture Contests.

Eleven schools, 35.5 percent, reported that they had participated in Dairy Cattle Contests since 1970. Ten schools, 32.2 percent, reported that they had participated in Poultry and Public Speaking Contests since 1970. Nine

TABLE XI

COMPARISON OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE ACTIVITIES

| Activity | Distribution Prior to 1970 N | % | Since 1970 N | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ag. Power and Machinery Contest | 5 | 16.1 | 3 | 9.7 |
| Crops Contest | 6 | 19.4 | 4 | 12.9 |
| Dairy Cattle Contest | 7 | 22.6 | 11 | 35.5 |
| Dairy Products Contest | 1 | 3.2 | 3 | 9.7 |
| Economics (Farm Management) Contest | 5 | 16.1 | 4 | 12.9 |
| Electricity Contest | 4 | 12.9 | 6 | 19.4 |
| Entomology Contest | 0 | 0 | 7 | 22.6 |
| Farm Shop (Ag. Mechanics) Contest | 9 | 29.0 | 4 | 12.9 |
| Farm Structures Contest | 4 | 12.9 | 4 | 12.9 |
| Horticulture Contest | 5 | 16.1 | 5 | 16.1 |
| Land Contest | 12 | 38.7 | 9 | 29.0 |
| Livestock Contest | 8 | 25.8 | 9 | 29.0 |
| Meats Contest | 7 | 22.6 | 8 | 25.8 |
| Parliamentary Procedure | 7 | 22.6 | 9 | 29.0 |
| Poultry Contest | 3 | 9.7 | 10 | 32.2 |
| Public Speaking | 10 | 32.2 | 10 | 32.2 |
| Range and Pasture Contest | 6 | 19.4 | 4 | 12.9 |
| Soil and Water Management Contest | 3 | 9.7 | 6 | 19.4 |
| Educational Trips | 5 | 16.1 | 5 | 16.1 |
| Others (Listed by Respondent) | | | | |
| Pig Sale | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.2 |
| Rodeo | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.2 |
| Tractor Safety School and Contest | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.2 |
| Fairs, Shows, Livestock and Crops Exhibits | 1 | 3.2 | 0 | 0 |

schools, 29 percent, stated that they had participated in Land, Livestock, and Parliamentary Procedure Contests since 1970. Eight schools, 25.8 percent, indicated that they had participated in Meats Contests since 1970. Seven schools, 22.6 percent, reported that they had entered Entomology Contests since 1970. Six schools, 19.4 percent, reported that they had entered Electricity and Soil and Water Management Contests since 1970.

In summary, it was of interest to note that in most cases, schools participated in a greater number of activities since 1970 than prior to 1970. A few of the schools reported that their level of participation since 1970 in a few of the contests was below that prior to 1970, but only a few.

Table XII reveals that the majority of the 31 schools included in the survey have actively participated in contest activities. Fourteen schools, 45.1 percent, and nearly half the survey schools, reported that they had always entered vocational agriculture contests. Twelve schools, 38.7 percent, stated that they frequently entered contests. Three, 9.7 percent, reported that they sometimes entered contests, and two, 6.5 percent, stated that they seldom entered contests.

TABLE XII

LEVEL OF PARTICIPATION IN CONTESTS

| Frequency | Distribution N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Always | 14 | 45.1 |
| Frequently | 12 | 38.7 |
| Sometimes | 3 | 9.7 |
| Seldom | 2 | 6.5 |
| Never | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 31 | 100.0 |

In summary, Table XII reveals that over eighty percent (83.8) of the survey schools actively participate in contests. It was of further interest to note that none of the schools reported that they never entered contests.

Table XIII shows the influence of non-farm students on the participation in contests.

Twenty schools, or 64.5 percent, reported that non-farm students had influenced their participation in contests. Eleven schools, or 35.5 percent, of the schools reported that non-farm students did not influence their participation in contests.

TABLE XIII

ANALYSIS OF INFLUENCE OF NON-FARM STUDENTS ON PARTICIPATION IN CONTESTS

| Influence of Non-Farm Students | Distribution N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 20 | 64.5 |
| No | 11 | 35.5 |
| Total | 31 | 100.0 |

In summary, Table XIII indicates that nearly two-thirds (64.5 percent) of the schools reported that non-farm students influenced their participation in contests.

Table XIV indicates that twenty-one, or 67.7 percent, of the survey schools reported that they participated in contests prior to 1970. Seven schools, or 22.6 percent, reported that they had participated in contests since 1970. Three schools did not respond to that particular question on the questionnaire.

In summary, Table XIV indicates that two-thirds of the survey schools indicated that they participated in contests prior to 1970.

TABLE XIV

BEGINNING OF PARTICIPATION IN CONTESTS

| Time Period | Distribution N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Prior to 1970 | 21 | 67.7 |
| Since 1970 | 7 | 22.6 |
| Total | 31 | 100.0 |

## Participation in Contests

Teachers of vocational agriculture in the survey schools were asked to give reasons as to why they began participating in contests. Nineteen teachers, approximately two-thirds, of the 31 responded to this question. Many varied reasons were given. The majority of reasons given, however, were educational, involvement or participation, leadership, and competition. Some reported that participation in contests gave their students with no supervised training projects a place to fit in.

Teachers responses follow:

"For publicity."

"In 1956 when I started teaching Vo-Ag, I considered this a part of teaching Vo-Ag so I have continued it."

"For competitive involvement with other chapters. To let the students who are prepared participate in contests to help to gain more confidence in themselves."

"Many reasons--leadership--competitive spirit, etc."

"I have always thought it a valuable part of the agriculture and FFA program. It gives the no-farm-no-project student a place to fit in."

"This is basic."

"It gives the student responsibility and also an opportunity to go places he or she has not seen."

"Because they are educational and excellent for students to develop leadership abilities."

"Provides a good way to test student's ability."

"Teacher interest."

"Give students something to work on who didn't have a supervised training program or much of one."

"To encourage competitive attitude and increase interest among students."

"For another means of competition."

"Motivation and an educational tool."

"For the education and competition of students."

"More involvement."

"To create enthusiasm and leadership; also, as an educational tool; public relations."

"To get more students participating."

"To involve FFA members in more activities. We have FFA members participate in (a) fairs and shows and/or (b) contests and/or (c) speeches. They must choose at least one area."

## Curriculum Changes

Only ten teachers who returned questionnaires responded or gave comments about any changes in their curriculum. Comments were quite varied and were as follows:

"I have had teams that have participated in all the activities listed above (activities listed in the questionnaire) in one year or another except Agriculture Power and Machinery since I have been teaching, but I do not consider them added. I feel that since core curriculum has been developed that this has made a big change along with the urban-influenced schools in shaping the curriculum taught."

"They will probably change some more."

"Added a summer course for one-half credit in Vocational Agribusiness Occupations."

"More work should be done in the area of horticulture (vegetable production)."

"Our curriculum is geared to fit the student with skills in all areas of agriculture."

"Mainly, Career Education and VAOT program."

"We are a very small rural community and all my students are rural-oriented and have access to projects."

"These non-farm students need this training (Vocational Agriculture--FFA) as much or more than others. It can work well in the metro areas."

"I need a three-teacher department (Shop, Horticulture, Agriculture Production) with heavy emphasis on contest work."

"I am 100% curriculum; I can suggest no improvements at this time."

"Some changes in my curriculum have been: (1) Introduction of the Vo-Ag Core Curriculum; (2) Lack of facilities to fully instruct students in certain areas; (3) Lack of funds to purchase the needed instructional materials; (4) Interest and needs of some classes differ: (a) My present Vo-Ag II class is primarily non-farm students, most with average or below grades, interested primarily in shop. (b) My present Vo-Ag IV class consists primarily of students interested in fairs and shows and raising livestock."

# CHAPTER IV

## SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As previously stated, the primary purpose of this study was to compare the changes in curriculum taught vocational agriculture students living in urban-influenced areas. A secondary purpose was to secure information which may be used by high schools in counseling and establishing optimum curriculum requirements for urban-influenced areas.

### Summary of Findings

This survey revealed that nearly half the teachers surveyed indicated that the non-farm student had influenced the curriculum offered at their schools both prior to and since 1970. However, only one-fourth of those teachers indicated that the non-farm student had greatly influenced the curriculum offered at their schools.

Data further revealed that over half the students enrolled in vocational agriculture in 1974 in the survey schools lived within city limits and that nearly half of all students enrolled in vocational agriculture had parents whose occupations were unrelated to agriculture.

As to vocational agriculture units of instruction, Career Education and Agribusiness were by far the two units of instruction which had been added since 1970. Data revealed that nearly two-thirds of the schools surveyed revealed that the number of non-farm students had influenced the units of instruction which had been added.

A School Farm was the one facility added most since 1970. Data further revealed that in nearly two-thirds of the survey schools the non-farm students had influenced the facilities added.

Information further revealed that most of the 31 schools surveyed participated in contest activities and that most of them participated more actively since 1970. Again, nearly two-thirds of the schools reported that the non-farm students had influenced participation in contest activities.

## Conclusions

Although the writer realizes that this survey is not a complete one, he does feel that it is indicative of a major part of the schools in Oklahoma and has made the following conclusions:

(1) There is a place in vocational agriculture for the non-farm student.

(2) Vocational agriculture curriculum and priorities must concern themselves with both the farm and non-farm student.

(3) Vocational agriculture programs and priorities must fit the individual needs of every student enrolled in its programs and also the community, the state, and the country.

(4) If this survey is indicative of the urban-influenced vocational agriculture programs over the state (and the writer believes it is), it appears that vocational agriculture teachers in the state are aware of the problems of meeting the needs of all students--farm and non-farm--and are actively engaged in solving the problem.

## Recommendations

Based on this study, the writer would make these recommendations:

(1) Data and findings of this survey be made available to all teacher trainers of vocational agriculture instructors and to all vocational agriculture supervisory personnel.

(2) A follow-up study be made in five years to see if vocational agriculture programs are keeping pace and making improvements in vocational agriculture curriculum offered all students--farm and non-farm.

(3) A position be established on the state supervisory staff which would designate part-time efforts of one person for developing programs of supervised occupational experience based upon programs other than, or in addition to, production agriculture.

BIBLIOGRAPHY


1. Archer, Tom. "A Good Place to Go." The Agricultural Education Magazine, Volume 46 (March, 1974), p. 199.

2. Bjoraker, Walter T. and Fred J. Pumper. What Do Wisconsin Vo-Ag Teachers Teach? (Eric Document Reproduction Service, VT-ERIC 013 562).

3. Childers, Ralph E. "Selected Factors Which Apparently Influence Non-Farm Boys and Parents Expectations of Benefits from Enrollment in Vocational Agriculture." (Unpublished M.S. thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1969.)

4. Downs, Elvin. "A New Ball Game." The Agricultural Education Magazine, Volume 43 (December, 1970), pp. 144-145.

5. Faulkner, T. L. "Designing a Comprehensive Curriculum." The Agricultural Education Magazine, Volume 42, (May, 1970), pp. 276-277.

6. Foster, Parker V. "An Urban Agriculture Programs." The Agricultural Education Magazine, Volume 47 (July, 1974), p. 12.

7. Glancy, Fred F., Jr. "Is Vocational Agriculture a Challenge in Your School?" The Agricultural Education Magazine, Volume 44 (August, 1971) pp. 44-46.

8. Matteson, Harold R. "Career Education: What Is It?--Why Is It Important?" The Agricultural Education Magazine, Volume 45 (November, 1972), p. 104.

9. Meder, Richard T. "What Happens When Traditional Programs Are Not Appropriate?" The Agricultural Education Magazine, Volume 41 (May, 1969), p. 269.

10. Mills, Glen. "Agriculture and the Environment." The Agricultural Education Magazine, Volume 46 (December, 1973), p. 141.

11. Noakes, Harold L. "Planning Local Programs to Meet Interest and Needs." The Agricultural Education Magazine, Volume 28 (December, 1965), pp. 126, 140-141.

12. Patton, Bob and Dean Reeder. "Innovative Instructional Materials for Vocational Agriculture." The Agricultural Education Magazine, Volume 46 (July, 1973), pp. 12-13.

13. Regan, Ronald D. "A Comprehensive Program of Agricultural Education in Los Angeles." The Agricultural Education Magazine, Volume 41 (October, 1968), pp. 84-85, 87.

14. Sellers, L. L. "Challenge and Change in the 70's." The Agricultural Education Magazine, Volume 43 (December, 1970), p. 145.

15. Staller, Bernie. "Integrating Curriculum with Industry Needs." The Agricultural Education Magazine, Volume 44 (December, 1971), pp. 130-131.

16. Thur, John William. "Opinions of Oklahoma Vocational Agriculture Teachers Toward Future Trends in Supervised Training." (Unpublished M.S. thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1971.)

# APPENDIXES

## APPENDIX A

## SURVEY OF CURRICULUM OFFERED VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE STUDENTS IN URBAN-INFLUENCED AREAS

1. How long have you taught vocational agriculture?
   _____ 1 to 5 yrs. _____ 6 to 10 yrs. _____ 11 to 15 yrs.
   _____ 16 to 20 yrs. _____ 21 or more yrs.

2. How long have you taught vocational agriculture at present location? _____ years

3. Has the number of non-farm students caused any revision in your curriculum? Prior to 1970? _____
   Since 1970? _____ Both? _____

4. How much have you revised your curriculum in the past five years? Very greatly? _____ Greatly? _____
   Slightly? _____ Very slightly? _____ None? _____

5. Number of students who have a supervised training project _____

6. Number of students living within city limits _____

7. Number of students living in fringe areas (up to 5 A.) _____

8. Number of students living on acreages (5 to 20 A.) _____

9. Number of students living on farms (20 or more acres) _____

10. Number of students whose parents are in occupations related to agriculture (production, processing, distribution) _____

11. Number of students whose parents are part-time farmers _____

12. Number of students whose parents live in cities, own and operate a business and also own and operate a farm _____

13. Number of students whose parents are full-time farmers _____

14. Number of students whose parents are in occupations unrelated to agriculture (production, processing, distribution) _____

15. Number of non-farm students in 1974 _____

16. Number of farm students in 1974 _____

17. Number of non-farm students in 1970 _____

18. Number of farm students in 1970 _____

19. UNITS THAT HAVE BEEN ADDED

| Unit | Prior to 1970 | Since 1970 |
|---|---|---|
| Horticulture | _____ | _____ |
| Greenhouse management | _____ | _____ |
| Nursery production | _____ | _____ |
| Turf maintenance | _____ | _____ |
| Conservation | _____ | _____ |
| Agribusiness | _____ | _____ |
| Career education | _____ | _____ |
| Small animal care | _____ | _____ |
| Landscape | _____ | _____ |
| Vegetable production | _____ | _____ |
| Wildlife | _____ | _____ |
| Agriculture chemicals and use | _____ | _____ |
| Ecology | _____ | _____ |
| Small engines | _____ | _____ |
| Welding | _____ | _____ |
| Electricity | _____ | _____ |
| Masonry | _____ | _____ |
| Plumbing | _____ | _____ |
| Farm carpentry | _____ | _____ |

| Unit | Prior to 1970 | Since 1970 |
|---|---|---|
| Concrete | _____ | _____ |
| Farm structures | _____ | _____ |
| Others: | | |
| _____ | _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ | _____ |

20. Did the number of non-farm students have anything to do with the change in units added? Yes? _____ No? _____

21. FACILITIES THAT HAVE BEEN ADDED

| Facility | Prior to 1970 | Since 1970 |
|---|---|---|
| Shop | _____ | _____ |
| Greenhouse | _____ | _____ |
| Nursery | _____ | _____ |
| Laboratory | _____ | _____ |
| School farm | _____ | _____ |
| Others: | | |
| _____ | _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ | _____ |

22. Did the number of non-farm students have anything to do with the added facilities? Yes? _____ No? _____

23. ACTIVITIES THAT HAVE BEEN ADDED

| Contest | Prior to 1970 | Since 1970 |
|---|---|---|
| Agriculture power and machinery | _____ | _____ |
| Crops judging | _____ | _____ |
| Dairy cattle judging | _____ | _____ |
| Dairy products | _____ | _____ |
| Economics (farm management) | _____ | _____ |
| Electricity | _____ | _____ |
| Entomology | _____ | _____ |
| Farm shop | _____ | _____ |
| Farm structures | _____ | _____ |
| Horticulture | _____ | _____ |
| Land judging | _____ | _____ |

| Contest | Prior to 1970 | Since 1970 |
|---|---|---|
| Livestock judging | _____ | _____ |
| Meats judging | _____ | _____ |
| Parliamentary procedure | _____ | _____ |
| Poultry judging | _____ | _____ |
| Public speaking | _____ | _____ |
| Range and pasture judging | _____ | _____ |
| Soil and water management | _____ | _____ |
| Educational trips | _____ | _____ |
| Others: | | |
| _____ | _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ | _____ |

24. How often have you entered contests? Always? _____ Frequently? _____ Sometimes? _____ Seldom? _____ Never? _____

25. Did the number of non-farm students have anything to do with your participating in contests?
Yes? _____ No? _____

26. When did you begin participating in contests?
Prior to 1970? _____ Since 1970? _____

27. Why did you begin participating in contests?

28. Do you have any other comments not covered in this questionnaire about any changes in your curriculum?

## APPENDIX B

### LIST OF SCHOOLS USED IN SURVEY

| | |
|---|---|
| Altus | Meeker* |
| Bethel | Moore |
| Bixby | Muskogee |
| Broken Arrow | Newcastle |
| Carl Albert | Noble |
| Choctaw | Norman |
| Collinsville | Owasso |
| Dale | Ponca City |
| Edmond | Sand Springs |
| Ft. Gibson* | Sapulpa |
| Harrah | Shawnee |
| Jenks | Skiatook |
| John Marshall | Sperry |
| Jones | Stillwater |
| Lawton | Tecumseh |
| Lone Grove | Waukomis |
| McLoud | Yukon* |

*Did not return questionnaire.

VITA

James Edmond Yeisley

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE CURRICULUM CHANGES IN SCHOOLS IN URBAN-INFLUENCED AREAS

Major Field: Agriculture Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Ada, Oklahoma, September 18, 1931, the son of Mr. and Mrs. M. G. Yeisley.

Education: Graduated from Butner High School, Wewoka, Oklahoma, in May, 1950; received the Social Science degree in May, 1952, from Murray State College, Tishomingo, Oklahoma; received the Bachelor of Science degree, with a major in Agriculture Education, from Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, in May, 1954; completed requirements for the Degree of Master of Science at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, in May, 1975.

Professional Experience: Taught Vocational Agriculture at Atoka, Oklahoma, from 1954 to 1955; at Earlsboro, Oklahoma, from 1955 to 1959; at Bethel High School, Route 4, Shawnee, Oklahoma, from 1959 to present.

Professional Organizations: Member of the Oklahoma Vocational Agriculture Teachers' Association; National Vocational Agriculture Teachers' Association; Oklahoma Education Association.

Leadership Activities: Bethel Young Farmers; Bethel United Methodist Church; Bethel Acres Lions Club.